

\*\*E-Filed 1/25/2011\*\*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

AERO PRODUCTS INTERNATIONAL, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case Number 5:10-cv-02994-JF (PSG)

ORDER STAYING PROCEEDINGS  
AGAINST DEFENDANT OATEY  
COMPANY

Defendant Oatey Company (“Oatey”) moves to dismiss the claims of Plaintiff San Francisco Technology, Inc. (“SF Tech”), because Oatey already has settled a *qui tam* action brought against it by a different party in the Eastern District of Texas (“Texas Action”). SF Tech contends that the Texas Action should not have a preclusive effect on the instant claims because SF Tech was the first party to file a false marking claim as to the patents at issue in the two actions<sup>1</sup>. However, Oatey presents evidence that it already had reached a settlement with the *qui*

---


<sup>1</sup> Although the Texas action actually was filed first, an amended complaint asserting false marking claims based upon the specific patents at issue in the instant case was filed after the instant case had commenced.

1 *tam* plaintiff in the Texas Action prior to the filing of SF Tech's complaint. At oral argument,  
2 SF Tech requested that the Court stay the instant proceedings to permit it to intervene in the  
3 Texas Action for the purpose of obtaining relief from the settlement.

4 **ORDER**

5 Good cause therefor appearing, the instant proceedings are stayed as to Defendant Oatey  
6 Company for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this order or until the court in the  
7 Texas Action has ruled upon SF Tech's proposed motion to intervene. Should SF Tech fail to  
8 obtain relief from the settlement, Oatey's motion to dismiss will be granted.

9 DATED: January 25, 2011

10   
11 JEREMY FOGEL  
12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28